



December 28, 2000

Dear Workshop Participants:

**SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 14, 2000 POTRERO POWER PLANT UNIT 7
PROJECT DATA RESPONSES, SET 1 / DATA REQUESTS, SET 2 WORKSHOP —
SITING CASE 00-AFC-04**

Enclosed is Energy Commission staff's summary of the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project data request workshop on biological resources, soil and water resources, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and power plant reliability and efficiency. The workshop was held at the Potrero Hill Neighborhood House in San Francisco, California, on December 14, 2000.

The primary purposes of the workshop were: 1) to provide the staff with the opportunity to discuss the applicant's (Southern Energy Potrero, LLC) responses to staff's first set of data requests that were issued on November 7, 2000, and 2) to provide the applicant with the opportunity to ask staff clarifying questions about its second set of data requests which were issued on November 28, 2000.

The public was given the opportunity to provide both verbal and written comments. No written comments were received.

This summary is an informal record of the discussions that took place. It has been distributed to all project staff and to all other participants identified on the participant list attached to the summary. The summary provides the meeting participants with the opportunity to correct information that was misunderstood in the hope of having good communication and an efficient process. If you would like to make any changes or additions to the summary, please send them to me in writing. I will see that they are placed in the project file and that the appropriate staff and other meeting participants receive them. Please call me at (916) 653-0159 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Marc S. Pryor
Siting Project Manager
California Energy Commission
1516 9th St., M.S.-15
Sacramento, CA 95814

Enclosure

cc: Proof of Service

POTRERO POWER PLANT UNIT 7 PROJECT
00-AFC-4
DECEMBER 14, 2000
DATA RESPONSES, SET 1/DATA REQUESTS, SET 2
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Energy Commission's staff project manager for the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project siting case, Marc Pryor, opened the workshop at 2:00 p.m. at the Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, in San Francisco, California. Mr. Pryor explained that the purpose of the workshop was to discuss the issues related to biological resources, soil and water resources, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and power plant reliability and efficiency. Due to project conflicts Mr. Pryor represented staff in the technical areas of noise, and power plant reliability and efficiency. A list of participants is attached to this summary.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Energy Commission: Dr. Noel Davis, Sheri Koslovsky and Rick York

AQUATIC RESOURCES

Noel Davis, aquatic biologist consultant to Energy Commission staff, requested clarification of the applicant's response regarding the schedule for the biological surveys. She expressed particular concern about the applicant's response that the finalized protocol is anticipated to be submitted to the Energy Commission within several weeks. Because a Preliminary Staff Assessment is due in January, it is important to get the aquatic biology information as quickly as possible. The applicant's aquatic biology consultant, Tenera, clarified that the benthic invertebrate sampling had been completed that week. The fish sampling has been delayed pending obtaining permits to take endangered salmonids. Rick York of Energy Commission staff suggested that staff may be able to assist in expediting the permitting process. Dave Mayer and Carol Raifsnider, both of Tenera, said that they would get the information about who to contact regarding the permit to Mr. York. The permit for take of endangered salmonids would come from the National Marine Fisheries Service.

FISH SURVEYS

There was also a brief discussion about whether three months or a full year's worth of data are needed. The applicant, Energy Commission staff, and its consultants agreed to address a possible reduction in the frequency of data collection following review of the first three consecutive month's worth of data results by the Agency Working Group (AWG) that is assisting Energy Commission staff.

316(B) SURVEY

Tenera is waiting for approval by the Energy Commission and its consultants of the final sampling protocol before beginning the 316(b) sampling. They were awaiting some information from the California Department of Fish and Game to justify their identification of the source water and station locations. They propose to submit the final protocol the week of December 28, 2000. It is staff's position that the 316(b) surveys should be done for a year, but that after the first three consecutive months worth of data results are reviewed by the AWG, the number of data collection stations may be reduced.

TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES

DATA REQUEST No. 21

Shari Koslovsky, terrestrial biologist consultant to Energy Commission staff, referred the applicant to both the Metcalf and Otay Mesa siting cases for information on methods for calculating background atmospheric concentrations of both nitrogen (N) and sulfur (S).

SOIL & WATER RESOURCES

Energy Commission: Mr. Joseph O Hagan

There was no discussion needed.

AIR QUALITY

Energy Commission: Mr. Tuan Ngo

GENERAL

Staff informed the applicant that most of the November 17, 2000, responses to staff's data requests are satisfactory. However, there are three issues that staff will need to address further.

SO2 OFFSETS

Because the area is non-attainment for the state 24-hr PM10 standard, and that SO2 is a precursor to PM10, staff requests the applicant to provide SO2 offsets.

EMISSION REDUCTION CREDITS

Because the emission reduction credits provided as offsets are located more than 25 miles upwind of the Potrero facility, staff informed the applicant that it will be request an analysis of the effectiveness of the offsets in mitigating the project contributions, especially for PM10.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Staff informed the applicant that the responses to staff's concerns about the impacts from the construction of the facility and the transmission line are not adequate. Staff suggested that the applicant re-estimate the construction emissions using more accurate construction schedule and construction mitigation measures. These revised emissions will be used to estimate the facility and the transmission line construction impacts.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Energy Commission: Mr. Gary Reinoehl, and Dr. Roger Mason

DATA REQUESTS NOS. 30 - 32

Data Requests 30-32 dealt with the requested inventory and evaluation of historical architectural resources for the project Area of Potential Effects (APE). The written response stated that the architectural report would be provided with the amendment information. Mr. Reinoehl asked if the architectural information for the area not affected by the amendment (the transmission line to Hunter's Point) could be provided sooner. Elena Nilsson, consultant to the applicant, replied that they preferred to do only one architectural report that would be provided as part of the project amendment (for demolition) in mid-January. Mr. Reinoehl provided additional written information on historical structures provided to him by the City of San Francisco. Mr. Pryor said the material would be docketed.

DATA REQUEST NO. 34

Mr. Reinoehl requested that the APE be expanded to include the portion of San Francisco Bay where submerged or buried historical resources, such as shipwrecks, could be impacted by construction. Elena Nilsson agreed.

DATA REQUESTS NOS. 36 - 39

Data Requests 36-39 dealt with the accessibility of portions of the project area so that testing to identify and evaluate buried cultural resources could be performed. It was agreed that testing within the power plant could not be performed until the proposed demolition of certain buildings has occurred.

DATA REQUEST NO. 40

Data Request 40 dealt with the requested research design for testing. The written response indicated that a research design was being submitted. Since then, a research design was received and reviewed by Energy Commission staff. Mr. Reinoehl pointed out that the research design was too general to allow specific resources that might be encountered during testing or construction monitoring to be evaluated so that, if eligible, data recovery could be performed without further review. He was concerned that there would not be enough time to prepare a more detailed research design and have it

reviewed once resources were encountered and suggested that this could hold up construction.

Mr. Reinoehl presented two options for the research design. Option 1 is to proceed with the existing general research design with the understanding that this may delay construction if resources are found. Option 2 is to prepare a more detailed research design that would provide research values for each kind of resource that might be encountered so that evaluation of significance (eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources) can be accomplished as soon as the resource is discovered. The research design should also contain a data recovery plan for specific resources so that if resources are evaluated as eligible, data recovery could commence immediately.

Elena Nilsson agreed to prepare a more detailed research design.

Mr. Reinoehl asked for more information about the dwelling mentioned as being located next to the powder magazine. Elena Nilsson said it was discussed in the Wirth report.

Mr. Reinoehl also suggested a more intensive test program with shorter intervals between the auger holes and a greater diameter auger. Dr. Mason suggested a 10 m interval between augers and a shift to 5 m intervals if something is found. He also suggested using a bucket auger to better control the depth at which cultural material is found and to increase the diameter of the auger. Elena Nilsson agreed to use a bucket auger at the stated intervals.

DATA REQUESTS NOS. 155 & 156

Data Requests 155 and 156 dealt with the potential for underwater buried cultural resources in the bay, which had not been addressed in the AFC. Elena Nilsson reported that no wharves or shipwrecks have been reported beyond the current shoreline in the Potrero area. However, Elena Nilsson stated that they will have an archaeological monitor present to observe the geotechnical borings that will be done in the bay. These borings will be placed where construction impacts will occur.

Mr. Reinoehl asked what agencies and records had been consulted to document the absence of underwater resources. Elena Nilsson replied that they used the State Lands website. Mr. Reinoehl asked if they had contacted the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). Elena Nilsson replied that they contacted the Information Center at Sonoma State University that has a contract with the USACOE to inventory shipwrecks in San Francisco Bay. Although this work is not yet complete, no shipwrecks have been identified so far in the Potrero area. Mr. Reinoehl suggested they contact Richard Stratford at the USACOE.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No written public comments were received.

**POTRERO POWER PLANT UNIT 7 PROJECT
NOVEMBER 20, 2000
DATA REQUESTS, SET 1, WORKSHOP
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Marc Pryor
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, M.S.-15
Sacramento, CA 95814

Monica Schwebs
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mark Harrer
Southern Company
1350 Treat Bl., Ste. 500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dale D. Shileikis, et al
Dames & Moore
221 Main St., Ste. 600
San Francisco, CA 94105-1917

Noel Davis, Ph.D.
Chambers Group
17671 Cowan Av., Ste. 100
Irvine, CA 92614

Carol Raifsnider
Tenera Energy
1 Market 180 Spear Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105

Gary Reinoehl
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, M.S.-40
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tuan Ngo
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, M.S.-14
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Emilio E. Varanini
Livingston & Mattesich
1201 K St., Ste. 1100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mike Foster, Ph.D.
Moss Landing Marine Laboratory
Moss Landing Rd.
Moss Landing, CA

Dave Meyer
Tenera Energy
1 Market 180 Spear Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105